

reserve, it is essential that they are properly resourced for both their overseas and homeland missions.

This bill provides \$6.9 billion, \$600 million more than the President's request, to address equipment shortfalls in the Reserve components. It also extends health care coverage for the National Guard and Reserve and makes essential investments in National Guard facilities, including the Fairfield, Cedar Rapids, Muscatine, and Middletown facilities in my district.

I am very proud also that the NDAA includes an amendment I offered with Ms. BORDALLO to improve National Guard readiness by requiring the Secretary of the Army to report to Congress on the creation of a Trainees, Transients, Holdees, and Students Account.

At any given time, 13.3 percent of the Army National Guard is nondeployable, and this account would serve as a temporary unit for these soldiers. In so doing, it would end the practice of borrowing soldiers from one unit in order to improve the readiness of others and will improve both morale and overall readiness.

I strongly urge support for the rule and for the underlying bill.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Republican whip, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering the rule for a bill to develop and deploy defensive capabilities for the protection of the American people, our stationed men and women, and our allies. The rising threat from North Korea and Iran highlights why our national security strategy must include a comprehensive, multilayered, and robust missile defense program to protect our homeland.

Both of these rogue nations, Mr. Speaker, provocatively flaunt their growing capabilities with long-range missiles and nuclear programs. Just last week, we learned that North Korea is planning to launch a missile towards the U.S. around the 4th of July holiday. To repeat a phrase used by our President just last week, these regimes pose a "grave threat" to the safety and security of our citizens and our allies.

Yet the bill which is the subject of this rule, Mr. Speaker, sustains an inexplicable \$1.2 billion cut from the missile defense budget. Mr. Speaker, the question before us is very simple: How do we reconcile gutting missile defense when it will defend against what our own President rightfully calls a "grave threat"? It simply doesn't make sense.

The cuts include a 35 percent reduction to the Ground-based Midcourse Defense program, a system located in Alaska and California for the purpose of protecting this country against the type of missile North Korea is gearing up to launch.

This is not the time to be reducing our commitment to missile defense. We

must fund the current missile defense systems that protect us today and the forward-looking programs that will protect us tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, we must restore the \$1.2 billion cut from the missile defense programs today.

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I yield 3 minutes to the Chair of the Committee on Financial Services, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I cannot remember the last time I was as deeply disappointed in the actions of people with whom I generally agree and continue to admire as I am by this rule.

President Obama, to his credit, has become the first President to try to put on to military spending the same kind of notion that resources are limited that people apply elsewhere. Military spending, in which old threats are continued to be dealt with while new threats are dealt with, make it impossible for us to talk about curtailing a deficit without doing damage elsewhere.

To his credit, President Obama and Secretary Gates said we do not need to build more F-22s. It was conceived to defeat the Soviet Union in a war. It's over. It's a wonderful weapon. It just has a terrible defect for a weapon—no enemy, no military mission. It will never be fired in anger.

It is bad enough that the committee, by only a 31-30 vote, undercut this President's effort to begin to apply fiscal discipline everywhere. Sure, military is important, but health care is important and highway safety is important and local police are important. All of those impinge on our life and all must be dealt with in discipline in the fiscal area, except military gets a pass.

I was particularly disappointed when the Rules Committee, because of some in the leadership, decided not even to allow us to debate it. A major initiative of the new President to curtail excess military spending is overturned by one vote in committee, and we are not even allowed to debate it.

And I have to say to my Republican friends, it is clear to me that their interest in open debate is very selective. They are for openly debating anything they want to debate, but they were opposed to this amendment coming on as well. So there's no consistency or principle of: Let's have open debate. It's: Let's get what we want and let's forget about the rest.

It has been said that truth is the first casualty of war. Apparently, intellectual integrity and logical consistency are the first casualties of a military bill.

I heard Members say a few months ago, Oh, an economic recovery program. Federal spending can't bring jobs. Federal Government spending adds to the deficit. It doesn't bring jobs.

Lo and behold, the F-22 became a jobs bill. It's what I call weaponized Keynesianism. Only if you're building

weapons, particularly weapons that will never be used, is there a stimulative effect in the economy.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. If the gentleman yields me time, I will.

Secondly, we are told that we have to deal with the deficit. The President made a beginning in trying to curtail military spending on weapons he said we do not need. If this bill goes through, as it apparently will, because we could not even debate it, his efforts will be undercut. The floodgates will be open, and any effort to have reasonable constraints on military spending, as we have on police and fire and emergency medical and other things that are important for health and safety, will be undercut.

This is a terrible decision and a terrible precedent. Of course, to add injury to injury, they did it by taking money out of environmental cleanup.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to point out to my friend that despite the fact that we support the committee having maintained the production line for the F-22, we made a motion in committee for an open rule that would have permitted the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I will yield.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I will acknowledge that. I was in error, and I apologize. It had been reported to me that there were votes against it, so I apparently got bad information. And I thank the gentleman for that futile gesture on my behalf.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I thank the gentleman for his debate. Despite the fact that we're in disagreement on this issue, he is a great parliamentarian and it's an honor to serve with him.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I want to thank my friend from Florida for yielding time. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater priority for the Federal Government than the defense of our Nation, and the Defense Authorization bill is a vehicle for setting military priorities for our country.

This bill also has jurisdiction over the Nation's defense nuclear waste cleanup program administered by the Department of Energy. The Environmental Management program within the Department is responsible for cleaning up the waste of our Nation's nuclear weapons production sites; production sites like Hanford, in my district, that secured our Nation's victory in World War II and in the Cold War.

As a result of that work, these sites are now contaminated with massive volumes of radioactive and hazardous waste. The Federal Government has a legal obligation to clean up these sites.